APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,546	10/23/2003	John R. Chase	ALTRP098/A1185	3624

51501   7590   03/27/2009
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP - ALTERA
ATTN: ALTERA
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER
LO, SUZANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2128	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action **Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**	10/693,546	CHASE, JOHN R.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SUZANNE LO	2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

     Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

   See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

                              /Hugh Jones/
                              Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2128

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arugments are unpersuasive.
In response to Applicant's argument that sufficient structure exists to transform a general purpose microprocessor to a special purpose computer programmed to perform the disclosed algorithm and that the apparatus claims produce a tangible result, the apparatus itself is directed software per se. While the purpose of the software when excuted may produce a tangible result, the software itself is not tangible and therefore is nonstatutory per se.

In response to Applicant's argument that test cases of Whitten are not test designs of the claimed invention, Applicant's have not provided any support in the specification where a test design cannot be a test case. Furthermore, as the test designs are applied to the EDA to test the EDA tool, by definition they are test cases utilized the EDA tool.

In response to Applicant's argument that blocks of code are not submodules due to the specification regarding submodule embodiments, the Examiner notes that the specification describes possible submodules but does not define the necessary characteristics of a submodule.

In response to Applicant's argument that the code blocks are not selected from a design module library to generate a plurality of test designs, Applicant is directed to column 5, lines 23-52 wherein Whitten maintains a list of code blocks to be selected and are used to generate test cases.

In response to Applicant's argument that Whitten does not teach submodules with input and output lines, the Applicant is directed to column 4, lines 54-63 wherein the subroutines, calls and branches of code blocks are input and output lines.

In repsonse to Applicant's argument that Bening does not teach instantiating the I/O structure of a top level module, in order to link a definition for a specific, instantiated module by referencing application-oriented libraries, one must first instantiate the instantiated module.

In response to Applicant's argument that Bening is not entirely focused on EDA tool coding requirement and therefore no motivation to combine exists, Applicant is directed to page 47, 2nd paragraph wherein Bening is still concerned with optimizing EDA tools.